



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,433	01/23/2006	Ming Li	14184.0005USWO	1876
23552	7590	10/16/2007	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD PC			MCCORMICK, MELENIE LEE	
P.O. BOX 2903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			1655	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/16/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/538,433	LI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Melenie McCormick	1655

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 13-15 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' remarks with claim amendments submitted 27 September 2007 have been received and considered.

Claims 13-15 are presented for examination on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of treating skeletal muscle injuries in an animal, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method for treating bone defects or bone fractures in an animal. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims, as broadly claimed by Applicant.

The claims are directed to for a method for treating skeletal muscle injuries, bone defects, or bone fractures in an animal comprising administering to the animal suffering from skeletal injuries, bone defects, or bone fractures an effective amount of an organic extract from *Geum Japonicum* thumb var.

Art Unit: 1655

The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required are summarized in *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (a) the breadth of the claims; (b) the nature of the invention; (c) the state of the prior art; (d) the level of one of ordinary skill in the art; (f) the amount of direction provided by the inventor; (g) the existence of working examples; and (h) the quantity of experimentation added to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. While all of these factors are considered, a sufficient number are discussed below so as to create a *prima facie* case.

While Applicant has reasonably demonstrated a method enabling for treating skeletal muscle injuries in an animal, Applicant has not demonstrated a method for treating bone defect or bone fractures in an animal comprising administering to the animal suffering from bone defects or bone fractures an effective amount of an organic extract from *Geum Japonicum thumb var.* For example, on 10 of the present specification, example 3, Applicant has demonstrated or disclosed the effects of an extract from *Geum Japonicum thumb var.* on muscle injury in the rat.

Nowhere in the specification as originally filed does Applicant demonstrate the claim-designated effect of treating bone fractures or bone defects comprising administering to an animal in need thereof an effective amount of an organic extract from *Geum Japonicum thumb var.*

It should be noted that at the time of filing of the present application, the art of medicine did not recognize the administration of an effective amount of an organic extract from *Geum Japonicum thumb var.* for the treatment of any and all bone defects

or bone fractures. For instance, Kumar et al. (RadioGraphics, 1999) teaches a type of bone defect (fibrous lesions), including benign cortical defect (see e.g. page 239) which is not known to be treated with *Geum Japonicum thumb var.* or an extract thereof.

Thus, while Applicant has demonstrated a method for enabling for treating skeletal muscle injuries comprising administering to the animal suffering from the skeletal injuries an effective amount of *Geum Japonicum thumb var.*, Applicant has not demonstrated the claim-designated method for treating bone defects an dbone fractures comprising the administration of an organic extract from *Geum Japonicum thumb var.* Therefore, it would require undue experimentation without a reasonable expectation of success in order to determine the means necessary to treat bone defects and bone fractures with an organic extract of *Geum Japonicum thumb var* comprising the administration thereof, as broadly claimed by Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The previous rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C 103 has been withdrawn in view of Applicants' remarks and amendments to the claims.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melenie McCormick whose telephone number is (571) 272-8037. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on (571) 272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Melenie McCormick
Examiner
Art Unit 1655



CHRISTOPHER R. TATE
PRIMARY EXAMINER